

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 20 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1, 7 and 12 have been amended, and claim 6 has been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added and support for the amendments to the claims can be found in the specification and drawings. It is believed that the amendments to the claims overcome the Examiner's objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112. In view of the above claim amendments and arguments for patentability presented hereinbelow, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over British Telecommunications ("Speech Mail," British Telecommunications, 2000, Web Site, Available at <http://www.btinternet.com> and <http://www.btinternet.com/new/content/mobile/speechmail/register.html>) ("British Telecommunications") in view of Hartman U.S. Patent No. 5,960,411 ("Hartman"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the combination of British Telecommunications and Hartman fails to disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

In accordance with an aspect of the invention, a system and methodology are provided for enabling intuitive and expedited service registration and activation for enhanced messaging services which relate to an existing messaging service account. For example, assume that an existing electronic mail account has service provided by a first service provider. A second service provider may offer a so called "auxiliary service" that enables the electronic mail account to be accessed through the telephone. The present invention enables a user to activate the auxiliary service with the second service provider without the need for the user to perform undue and burdensome information entry during the activation process to obtain telephone access through the second service provider. In this connection, the second service provider accesses the registration information provided to the first service provider, such that the user is not required to repeat entries of redundant and/or unmemorable personal/account information or login

credentials which may have been previously provided by the user during registration and activation of the user's existing electronic mail account with the first service provider (e.g., the user's name, address, telephone number, mail server name, IP address, etc).

Representative claim 1, as amended, calls for a method of providing enhanced service activation for auxiliary services that provide access to one or more existing messaging accounts belonging to one or more account holders, *the auxiliary services being provided by service providers distinct from the account providers providing the one or more existing messaging accounts*, the method comprising:

receiving a request for activation of the one or more auxiliary services from the one or more account holders;

accessing registration information for the one or more existing messaging accounts; and

providing for service activation for the one or more auxiliary services, wherein information related to the existing messaging accounts is utilized for providing for service activation for the one or more auxiliary services *so that the same activation information provided by the one or more account holders to the account providers that are providing the one or more existing messaging accounts does not have to be provided by the one or more account holders to the service providers that provide the auxiliary services*. Emphasis added.

The Examiner contends:

British Telecommunications discloses a method for providing enhanced service activation for auxiliary services that provide access to one or more existing messaging accounts belonging to one or more account holders, the auxiliary services being provided by service providers distinct from the account providers providing the one or more existing messaging accounts, the method comprising: receiving a request for activation of the one or more auxiliary services from the one or more account holders (SpeechMail registration)(Page 3) and providing for service activation for the one or more auxiliary services (activate SpeechMail and provide account/access number)(Page 2, lines 6-13). British Telecommunications fails to specifically disclose accessing registration accessing registration information for the

one or more existing messaging accounts and using information related to the existing messaging accounts is [sic] for providing service activation for the one or more auxiliary services so that no substantial additional activation information has to be provided by the one or more account holders. Office Action at p. 4, ¶12.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion. British Telecommunications *does not* disclose or suggest providing "access to one or more existing messaging accounts belonging to one or more account holders, the auxiliary services being provided by service providers distinct from the account providers providing the one or more existing messaging accounts." There is absolutely nothing in the British Telecommunications Web literature that would suggest that the SpeechMail service is being provided by a different service provider than the user's e-mail service. Accordingly, there is nothing here suggesting that registration information may be accessed by a second service provider that provides the auxiliary service in the manner being claimed by Applicants. British Telecommunications merely discloses a SpeechMail service that enables a user's e-mail messages to be retrieved over the telephone, and that such a service may be subscribed to by undertaking a defined registration process with British Telecommunications. The registration process described therein is completely silent as to the manner in which that account is accessed. Specifically, there is nothing in British Telecommunications that discloses, suggests or mentions anything about registering with a second service provider for phone access and, more significantly, a manner in which such a registration might be effectuated vis-à-vis the e-mail service provider.

The Examiner cites to Hartman as follows:

Hartman teaches the accessing of stored registration information to accelerate the process of ordering a product or service on the Internet. Registration information, previously provided by the customer, is stored at the server (Hartman, Col. 6, Lines 39-56). When the user wishes to place an order, they simply press a button associated with that order. The server identifies the customer, accesses the stored registration information, and places the order using the stored registration information (Hartman, Col. 7, lines 25-30). This is advantageous since it allows the customer to place

orders without resubmitting information such as addresses and phone numbers, greatly accelerating the ordering process.

Applicants respectfully submit that the addition of Hartman fails to remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of British Telecommunications. Hartman discloses a “single-action” ordering system for reducing the number of purchaser interactions needed to place an order in a client/server environment. As described in Hartman:

The single-action ordering system of the present invention reduces the number of purchaser interactions needed to place an order and reduces the amount of sensitive information that is transmitted between a client system and a server system. In one embodiment, the server system assigns a unique client identifier to each client system. The server system also stores purchaser-specific order information for various potential purchasers. The purchaser-specific order information may have been collected from a previous order placed by the purchaser. The server system maps each client identifier to a purchaser that may use that client system to place an order. The server system may map the client identifiers to the purchaser who last placed an order using that client system. When a purchaser wants to place an order, the purchaser uses a client system to send the request for information describing the item to be ordered along with its client identifier. The server system determines whether the client identifier for that client system is mapped to a purchaser. If so mapped, the server system determines whether single-action ordering is enabled for that purchaser at that client system. If enabled, the server system sends the requested information (e.g., via a Web page) to the client computer system along with an indication of the single action to perform to place the order for the item. *When single-action ordering is enabled, the purchaser need only perform a single action (e.g., click a mouse button) to order the item.* When the purchaser performs that single action, the client system notifies the server system. The server system then completes the order by adding the purchaser-specific order information for the purchaser that is mapped to that client identifier to the item order information (e.g., product identifier and quantity). *Thus, once the description of an item is displayed, the purchaser need only take a single action to place the order to purchase that item.* Also, since the client identifier identifies purchaser-specific order information already stored at the server system, there is no need for such sensitive information to be transmitted via the Internet or other communications medium. Col. 3, line 33 – col. 4, line 3. Emphasis added.


Applicants submit that this disclosure has nothing to do with the present invention. Hartman simply stands for the proposition that a user's purchasing information (i.e., credit card, shipping address, etc.) may be stored on a server and subsequently utilized to facilitate the user's purchase of goods/services with a single action, thereby obviating the need for the user to enter all of this information at the time of each purchase. There is absolutely no teaching, suggestion, or mention in Hartman of using registration information provided to a first service provider *to facilitate registration with a second service provider* where the second service provider provides auxiliary services related to the services provided by the first service provider. It is therefore respectfully submitted that even if, assuming *arguendo*, British Telecommunications and Hartman would be properly combinable, such combination would still fail to reach the claimed invention. In view of the above, it is further submitted that independent claim 1 and those claims dependent on claim 1 are patentable over the combination of British Telecommunications and Hartman. Since independent claims 7 and 12 contain similar limitations, it is believed that these claims and those claims dependent thereon are patentable for the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 – 20 are patentable over the cited art and allowance of these claims at an early date is solicited.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 to AT&T Corp. Account No. 01-2745. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (908) 707-1573 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Kocheisen, et al.
By:

Date: 4/19/05



Gary H. Monka
Registration No. 35,290
Attorney for Applicant

Canavan & Monka, LLC.
250 State Route 28, Suite 207
Bridgewater, New Jersey 08807
(908) 707-1573